



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,468	03/27/2006	Thomas Bernhard Pabst	003D.0042.U1(US)	4113
29683 7590 06/15/2007 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,468

Applicant(s)

PABST ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/4/07.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The reply filed on 5/18/07 consists of amendments to claims 1,3, 5-7, cancellation of claim 2, addition of new claim 11 and remarks related to rejection of claims. The applicant also submitted an IDS and a search report on 5/4/07. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement filed 5/4/07 should have included all the references cited in the search report submitted on 5/4/07 but US 4,420,211 and JP 7-130415 were missing. An English translation of the search report should be also submitted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-4 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glovatsky et al. (6299469) in view of Ledbetter (4420211).

Glovatsky (Figures 1-8B) shows a plug connector comprising a first housing half 40, a second housing half 38 which can be locked in a final locking position as shown in Figure 4 and electrically conductive clamp 58 to place two flat conductors ( flat flexible ribbon conductors) 32, 36 with a plurality of conductive tracks 28, 28 in contact. The

Art Unit: 2839

clamp is U-shaped with two legs and each leg contacts at least one conductor. The clamp is arranged in a recess in the housing half 38 and the other housing half have a shoulder 42. The clamp is cutting clamp.

But Glovatsky does not show a prelocking position of the two housing halves. Such a feature is well known and widely used in the art of electrical connectors. Ledbetter (Figure 1) shows such a feature where the shoulders 26 on one housing half are engaged in holes 28 of the other housing half. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature because this would provide a means to align the two housing halves as taught by Ledbetter (please note that the instant invention calls such a feature as prelocking instead of alignment). Further it should be noted that the instant invention calls flat cables 4 and 5 as flat conductors and the actual conductors 6 as tracks.

5. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glovatsky et al. (6299469) as modified by Ledbetter (4420211) and further in view of Bennett et al. (4900264).

Glovatsky as modified by Ledbetter shows all the features of these claims except a rib pressing the conductor into a recess and overlapping of the conductors. These features are well known and widely used in the art of electrical connectors. Bennett shows these features (see Figure 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide these features in order to provide strain relief to both conductors as taught by Bennett.

Glovatsky as modified by Ledbetter does not show one of the housing half made in two parts. Bennett shows such a feature (see Figure 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make one of the housing half in two parts as shown by Bennett since it has been held that forming a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art.

Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glovatsky et al. (6299469) as modified by Ledbetter (4420211) and further in view of Chishima et al. (5820404).

Glovatsky as modified by Ledbetter shows all the features of this claim except each leg of the clamp having two arms. Such a feature is well known and widely used in the art of electrical connectors. Chishima shows such a feature (see Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature because this would facilitate cutting of the insulation and securing the conductors at two places as shown by Chishima.

### **Conclusion**

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. DE 100 65 972 also reads on claim 1-5 and 7-11.

8. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 5/4/07 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

**FINAL.** See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2839

***Response to Arguments***


10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections. Applicant's arguments related to Bennett for strain relief are not supported by claim language.

***Contact Information***

11. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (571) 272-2099. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is 571-273-8300.

  
Chandrika Prasad  
Primary examiner  
June 3, 2007

12.